



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/299,139	04/23/1999	JEFFREY BROWNING	A013	2882
7590	08/24/2004		EXAMINER	YAEN, CHRISTOPHER H
BIOGEN INC. KERRY A FLYNN ESQ 14 CAMBRIDGE CENTER CAMBRIDGE, MA 02142			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1642	
			DATE MAILED: 08/24/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/299,139	BROWNING ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Christopher H Yaen	1642

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 April 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 17,18,36-56,58-60,71-78,84-90 and 95-117 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) 17,18,36-50 and 95-117 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 51-56,58-60,71-78 and 84-90 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The amendment filed 4/23/2003 (paper no. 20) is acknowledged and entered into the record. Accordingly, claims 61-70,79-83, and 91-94 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer and claims 95-117 are newly added.
2. Newly submitted claims 95-117 are directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons: The diseases and disorders encompassed represent independent and distinct inventions that differ at least in etiology, pathology, and mechanisms. As such, the newly submitted claims would require different searches and the consideration of different patentability issues.

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 95-117 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

3. Claims 17,18,36-56, 58-60,71-78, 84-90, 95-117 are pending, claims 17,18,36-50 and 95-117 are withdrawn from further consideration as being drawn to a non-elected subject matter. Applicant is reminded to cancel all claims drawn to a non-elected subject matter.
4. Therefore, claims 51-56, 58-60, 71-78, and 84-90 are examined on the record.

Claim Rejection Withdrawn - 35 USC § 112, 2nd paragraph

5. The rejection of claims 53, 58-60, 71-78, and 84-90 under 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph as being indefinite is withdrawn in view of the amendments and arguments provided by the applicant.

Claim Rejections Withdrawn - 35 USC § 112, 1st paragraph

6. The rejection of claims 51-60, 71-78, and 84-90 under 35 USC 112, 1st paragraph as lacking an enabling disclosure is withdrawn in view of the persuasive arguments provided by the applicant.

NEW ARGUMENTS

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, 1st paragraph

7. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

8. Claims 53, 58-60, 75, 86, and 90 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The written description in this case has set forth a ligand binding domain comprising an amino acid sequence of SEQ ID No: 1, and is therefore not commensurate in scope to claims that read of functional fragments, of SEQ ID No: 1.

The claims recite "a functional fragment" as part of the invention. However, there does not appear to be an adequate written description in the specification as-filed of the essential structural feature that provides the recited function of a fragment of SEQ ID No: 1. The Guidelines for the Examination of Patent Applications Under the 35 U.S.C. 112, ¶ 1 "Written Description" Requirement make clear that the written description requirement for a claimed genus may be satisfied through sufficient description of a representative number of species by actual reduction to practice, reduction to drawings, or by disclosure of relevant, identifying characteristics, i.e., structure or other physical and or chemical properties, by functional characteristics coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between function and structure, or by a combination of such identifying characteristics, sufficient to show the applicant was in possession of the genus (Federal Register, Vol. 66, No. 4, pages 1099-1111, Friday January 5, 2001, see especially page 1106 3rd column).

Applicant does not appear to have reduced to practice any functional fragment of SEQ ID No: 1. A "functional fragment" of SEQ ID No: 1 encompasses *any* molecule with similar sequence identity to SEQ ID No: 1, of which the applicant has not provided the actual amino acid sequence. Thus the genus of compounds encompassed by this term is extensive and the artisan would not be able to recognize that Applicant was in possession of the invention as now claimed.

Consequently, Applicant was not in possession of the instant claimed invention. See Regents of the University of California v. Eli Lilly and Co. 119 F.3d 1559, 43 USPQ2d 1398 (Fed. Cir. 1997). Adequate written description of genetic material

"requires a precise definition, such as by structure, formula, chemical name, or physical properties,' not a mere wish or plan for obtaining the claimed chemical invention." Id. 43 USPQ2d at 1404 (quoting Fiers, 984 F.2d at 1171, 25 USPQ2d at 1606). The disclosure must allow one skilled in the art to visualize or recognize the identity of the subject matter of the claim. Id. 43 USPQ2d at 1406.

While it is noted that the instant claims are drawn to methods, the claims nevertheless require an adequate written description of the "TCCR antagonist" employed in the methods.

Applicant is directed to the Guidelines for the Examination of Patent Applications Under the 35 U.S.C. 112, ¶ 1 "Written Description" Requirement, Federal Register, Vol. 66, No. 4, pages 1099-1111, Friday January 5, 2001. Applicant is invited to point to clear support or specific examples of the claimed invention in the specification as-filed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000.

Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

10. Claims 51-56, 58-60, 71-78, and 84-90 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Browning *et al* (US Patent 5,925,351, cited in the prior action).

The applied reference has common inventors with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

The claims of the instant invention are drawn to a method of administering a therapeutically effective amount of soluble lymphotoxin- β receptor (herein referred to as sLT β -R) of SEQ ID No: 1 in a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier. The claims are further limited by the sLT β -R further comprising a heterologous protein(s), wherein the heterologous protein is an Fc domain of an immunoglobulin. Browning *et al* claim a method of administering a pharmaceutical composition comprising a therapeutically effective amount of sLT β -R (see especially claims 1-6 and 11). It is also claimed that the sLT β -R further comprises an Fc domain of a immunoglobulin, and that the composition be administered to humans. Although not specifically stated in the Browning *et al*, in the absence of evidence to the contrary the functional limitation of "without inhibiting TNF-R signaling" is considered an inherent property of the product. Furthermore, because the invention claimed by Browning *et al* is administered to a

mouse, the limitations of claim 72 are anticipated because a mouse is a mammal and by definition, all mammals are multi-cellular.

Conclusion

No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher H Yaen whose telephone number is 703-305-3586. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anthony Caputa can be reached on 703-308-3995. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-4242 for regular communications and 703-305-3014 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0196.

Christopher Yaen
Art Unit 1642
August 17, 2004

Gary B Nickol
GARY NICKOL
PRIMARY EXAMINER